



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,357	09/20/2003	Craig A. Rosen	PS901	5455
22195	7590	08/01/2006	EXAMINER	
HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES INC. 14200 SHADY GROVE ROAD ROCKVILLE, MD 20850			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1656

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/664,357

Applicant(s)

ROSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-10, 15-16 and 22, drawn to nucleic acids, vectors, host cells and methods of making a polypeptide, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1 and class 435, subclasses 69.1, 320.1 and 325.
 - II. Claims 11-13 and 17, drawn to polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - III. Claim 14, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
 - IV. Claim 18, drawn to a method of preventing, treating or ameliorating a medical condition by administering a polypeptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
 - V. Claim 19, drawn to a method of diagnosing a pathological condition by determining the presence or absence of a mutation in a polynucleotide, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3, for example.
 - VI. Claim 20, drawn to a method of diagnosing a pathological condition by determining the presence or amount of expression of a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.
 - VII. Claim 21, drawn to a method of identifying a binding partner, classified in class 436, subclass 501, for example.
 - VIII. Claim 23, drawn to a method of identifying an activity in an assay, classified in class 435, subclass 4, for example.
 - IX. Claim 24, drawn to unknown product, classification cannot be determined.
2. The claims of Group I-IX are drawn to a multitude of nucleic acids (SEQ ID NO:

Art Unit: 1656

X), polypeptides (SEQ ID NO: Y), antibodies thereto and methods which use these compounds. Each of the different nucleic acids, polypeptides, antibodies and methods of use are independent and distinct because no common structural or functional properties are shared. Accordingly, these claims are subject to restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121.

Upon election of one of Groups I-IX, Applicant is additionally required to elect a **single** nucleic acid, polypeptide, or antibody. This requirement is not to be construed as a requirement for an election of species, since each of the compounds is not a member of a single genus of invention, but constitutes an independent and patentably distinct invention.

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

A) The inventions of Groups I, II and III are patentably distinct because they are drawn to different products having different structures and functions. The nucleic acid of Group I is composed of nucleotides linked in phosphodiester bonds and arranged in space as a double helix. The polypeptide of Group II is composed of amino acids linked in peptide bonds and arranged spatially in a number of different tertiary structures including alpha helices, beta-pleated sheets, and hydrophobic loops (transmembrane domain). The antibody of Group III is composed of amino acids linked in peptide bonds and arranged spatially in a very specific tertiary structure that allows that antibody to specifically bind to particular regions, i.e., epitopes, of the encoded polypeptide. Further, antibodies are glycosylated and their tertiary structure is unique, where four subunits (2 light chains and 2 heavy chains) associated via disulfide bonds into a Y-shaped

symmetric dimer. Furthermore, the products of Groups I, II and III can be used in materially different processes, for example, the DNA of Group I can be used in hybridization assays, the antibody of Group III can be used in immunoassay, the polypeptide of Group II can be used to make fusion protein with an enzymatic function. Consequently, the reagents, reaction conditions, and reaction parameters required to make or use each invention are different. Therefore, the inventions of Groups I, II and III are patentably distinct from each other. (See MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01, unrelated inventions)

B) Inventions (I-III) and IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to chemically different compounds, which can be made and used without each other. The structure of the compound of Group IX is not defined, however, it would appear that it lacks a common utility, which is based upon a common special technical feature (structure), which is disclosed as being responsible for the common utility.

C) Inventions II and (IV, VI and VII) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptides of Group II could be used in

Art Unit: 1656

an entirely different manner, such as in a method of making antibodies rather than in the methods of Groups IV, VI, and VII.

D) Inventions I and (IV, VI and VII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the DNA Group I is not required for the methods of Groups (IV, VI and VII) and can be used to make probes/primers.

E) Inventions I and (V and VIII) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the DNA of Group I could be used in an entirely different method, such as in the recombinant production of the polypeptide rather than in the methods of Group (V and VIII).

F) Inventions II and (V and VIII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polypeptide of Group II is not required for the methods of Groups (V and VIII).

G) Inventions III and (IV- VIII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation,

Art Unit: 1656

or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the antibody of Group III is not required for the methods of Groups (IV- VIII).

H) Inventions IV-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to methods, which have different method steps, starting materials and goals.

I) Inventions (IV-VIII) and IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to methods (Groups IV-VIII) which do not require the compound of Group IX and which are not disclosed as capable of use together.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a different status in the art as demonstrated by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter and because inventions I-IX require different searches that are not co-extensive, examination of these distinct inventions would pose a serious burden on the examiner and therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn

Art Unit: 1656

process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.

Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process

Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims.

Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr, can be reached at (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1656

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope A. Robinson, MS *HR*
Patent Examiner,
AU 1656 *7/24/06*

HOPE ROBINSON
PATENT EXAMINER

July 24, 2006